

NACA RM A55J07

RM A55J07



UNCLASSIFIED

NACA

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF TWO RECTANGULAR-PLAN-FORM,
ALL-MOVABLE CONTROLS IN COMBINATION WITH A SLENDER BODY
OF REVOLUTION AT MACH NUMBERS FROM 3.00 TO 6.25

By Thomas J. Wong and Hermilo R. Gloria

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory
Moffett Field, Calif.

CLASSIFICATION CHANGED

To UNCLASSIFIED

By authority of TRA # 58 Date Effective 10/16/61
msf

CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT

This material contains information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, Title 18, U.S.C., Secs. 793 and 794, the transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

WASHINGTON

December 28, 1955

CONFIDENTIAL

UNCLASSIFIED

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF TWO RECTANGULAR-PLAN-FORM,
ALL-MOVABLE CONTROLS IN COMBINATION WITH A SLENDER BODY
OF REVOLUTION AT MACH NUMBERS FROM 3.00 TO 6.25

By Thomas J. Wong and Hermilo R. Gloria

SUMMARY

Results of force and moment tests at Mach numbers from 3.00 to 6.25 on two rectangular-plan-form, all-movable controls in combination with a slender body of revolution are presented and compared with the predictions of theory. The controls had aspect ratios of $4/9$ and 1 (for exposed panels joined together) and ratios of body radius to wing semispan of 0.6 and 0.4, respectively. The body had a fineness ratio of 12. The models were tested at angles of attack up to 25° , control deflection angles from -30° to $+30^\circ$, and Reynolds numbers based on control chord from 0.23 million to 1.2 million, depending on test Mach number.

The results showed that lift variations with angle of attack were somewhat nonlinear for both control-body combinations tested. However, linearized wing-body interference theory when combined with experimentally determined characteristics of the body gave, for the most part, adequate predictions of lift, drag, and pitching-moment coefficients of the control-body combinations.

Control hinge moments were linear only at small angles of attack and control deflection. Hinge-moment parameters were influenced to a large extent by the shape of the airfoil section and, hence, were not well predicted by linear theory. A method which considers this effect, the slender-airfoil shock-expansion method, provided better estimates of these parameters.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of providing adequate control for missiles traveling at high supersonic speeds is aggravated by the well-known decrease in lift effectiveness of planar surfaces with increasing Mach number. Due to this decrease, it is often desirable at high supersonic speeds to

UNCLASSIFIED

employ the entire stabilizing surface for control - that is, as an all-movable control. For various reasons, these controls are generally small and, therefore, operate entirely within the disturbed flow field created by the missile body. It follows, then, that wing-body interference will usually play an important role in the aerodynamic characteristics of the body-control combinations.

At low supersonic speeds, the nature of wing-body interference is reasonably well understood. There is a large amount of experimental data available and several theories for treating the interference flows. For the case of an all-movable wing, the theoretical methods include that of Tucker (ref. 1) who treated only the lift, using linear theory with approximate boundary conditions. There is also the work of Nielsen, Kaattari, and Drake (ref. 2) which is based on a combination of linear and slender-body theory. This method provides predictions of the lift, pitching moment, and hinge moment. This result has been extended by Katzen and Pitts (ref. 3) to include predictions of drag. There are, in addition, several other methods available for low supersonic speeds. All of these methods are, in general, based on linear theory and they have been found to be adequate for predicting the aerodynamic forces and moments (with the possible exception of hinge moments) for wing-body combinations, subject, of course, to the usual restrictions of linear theory.

At high supersonic speeds, however, the situation is not so encouraging. There is not, at present, any mass of data available on the aerodynamic characteristics of all-movable wing-body combinations nor any well-established theory. Since the theoretical methods used at lower speeds are, as noted, based on linear theory, their application at high supersonic speeds is often suspect. More comparisons with experimental data are required before the limitations of the linearized methods can be ascertained accurately at high Mach numbers. As a step toward providing the needed experimental data, a program was undertaken to determine the aerodynamic characteristics of two all-movable wing controls in combination with a slender body of revolution. These controls had rectangular plan forms and were tested at Mach numbers from 3.00 to 6.25, angles of attack up to 25° , and angles of control deflection from -30° to $+30^\circ$. The results of this investigation are reported herein together with comparisons of the experimental characteristics with those predicted by theory.

SYMBOLS

- A aspect ratio (for exposed panels joined together), $\frac{(b - 2r_b)^2}{S}$
b control span
c control chord

C_L	lift coefficient, $\frac{\text{lift}}{q\pi r_b^2}$
C_D	drag coefficient, $\frac{\text{drag}}{q\pi r_b^2}$
C_m	pitching-moment coefficient about body nose, $\frac{\text{pitching moment}}{q\pi r_b^2 l}$
C_{Nc}	control-normal-force coefficient, $\frac{\text{control normal force}}{qS}$
C_h	hinge-moment coefficient, $\frac{\text{hinge moment}}{qSc}$
l	body length
M	Mach number
q	free-stream dynamic pressure
r	body radius
r_b	body radius at base
S	control plan area, exposed
x	longitudinal coordinate
\bar{x}	control center of pressure, fraction of control chord
\bar{x}_α	control center of pressure for α variable, $\delta = 0^\circ$, percent of control chord
\bar{x}_δ	control center of pressure for δ variable, $\alpha = 0^\circ$, percent of control chord
α	angle of attack of body
δ	control deflection angle relative to body axis, positive for downward deflection of trailing edge

Subscripts

α	rate of change with angle of attack, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha}$, unless otherwise specified
δ	rate of change with control deflection angle, $\frac{\partial}{\partial \delta}$, unless otherwise specified

EXPERIMENT

Test Apparatus and Methods

The tests were conducted in the Ames 10- by 14-inch supersonic wind tunnel at Mach numbers of 3.00, 4.23, 5.05, and 6.25. This facility is described in detail in reference 4.

Aerodynamic forces and moments were measured by a three-component strain-gage balance. Forces parallel and perpendicular to the balance axis and moments about the model base were measured directly and resolved to give lift, drag, and pitching moments about the body nose. Hinge moments and forces on the wing perpendicular to the body axis were measured by a two-component strain-gage balance mounted within the test body. Angles of attack greater than $+5^\circ$ were obtained by the use of bent sting supports. Tare forces on the stings were essentially eliminated by enclosing the stings in shrouds that extended to within 0.040 inch of the model base. Forces acting on the model base were determined from base-pressure measurements. These forces were subtracted from the measured forces acting on the entire model. The data presented, therefore, represent only the forces acting on the forward portion of the model, exclusive of the base.

Static and dynamic pressures were determined from wind-tunnel calibration data and stagnation pressures measured with a Bourdon type pressure gage. Reynolds numbers based on control chord length were:

<u>Mach number</u>	<u>Reynolds number, million</u>
3.00	1.20
4.23	1.09
5.05	.53
6.25	.23

Models

The models used in this investigation consisted of a slender body of revolution and two sets of all-movable controls. The pertinent dimensions of the models are given in figure 1. The body consisted of a $3/4$ -power profile nose section (see ref. 5) with a fineness ratio of 3, faired to a cylindrical afterbody having a fineness ratio of 9. The controls had aspect ratios of $4/9$ and 1 (for exposed wing panels joined together) and ratios of body radius to wing semispan of 0.6 and 0.4, respectively. Both controls had rectangular plan forms and a 4-percent-thick biconvex airfoil section with a 50-percent-blunt trailing edge. The control hinge-line was

located at 50 percent of chord and the gap between wing and body was 0.008 inch. The models were constructed of steel and had polished surfaces.

The models used in this investigation were not intended to represent practical aircraft configurations. The results, nevertheless, provide information on the relative merits of rectangular-plan-form controls and are useful for assessing the applicability of available theories for estimating the aerodynamic characteristics of all-movable wing and body combinations at high supersonic speeds.

Accuracy of Test Results

Variations in Mach number in the test region did not exceed ± 0.02 except at the maximum test Mach number of 6.25 where the variation was ± 0.04 . Deviations in stream Reynolds number for a given Mach number did not exceed $\pm 10,000$ from the mean values given in the previous section. The estimated errors in the angle of attack due to uncertainties in corrections for stream angle and for deflections of the model-support system were $\pm 0.2^\circ$.

The following table of uncertainties represents the maximum possible errors involved in the measurement of the aerodynamic forces and moments:

Quantity	M = 3.00	M = 4.23	M = 5.05	M = 6.25
C_D	± 0.013	± 0.02	± 0.02	± 0.04
C_L	± 0.013	± 0.02	± 0.02	± 0.04
C_m	± 0.010	± 0.02	± 0.02	± 0.04
C_h	± 0.005	± 0.01	± 0.01	± 0.02
C_{N_c}	± 0.01	± 0.02	± 0.02	± 0.04

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Experimental Results

The results obtained in the present investigation are given in tables I and II for the complete range of test variables. The coefficients for the control-body combinations are referenced to the body-base area; whereas the coefficients for the control in the presence of the body are referenced to the control-surface area.

Characteristics of the control-body combinations.- The variations of C_L with α , C_m , and C_D are presented in figure 2 for both configurations

tested. The results for both control-body combinations are essentially similar over the range of test parameters, the principal difference being in the magnitude of the control loads. This difference can be largely explained by the difference in control-surface area.

The variations of C_L with α are somewhat nonlinear and generally show increasing lift effectiveness with increasing angle of attack except at large values of $\alpha + \delta$ at $M = 3.00$ and 4.23 where appreciable reductions in lift effectiveness are observed. These reductions in lift effectiveness are also reflected in the drag polars, particularly those for the $A = 4/9$ control.

Control effectiveness.— The variations of lift coefficient with control deflection angles for both configurations at several angles of attack are presented in figure 3 for all test Mach numbers. The results are somewhat nonlinear and generally show only small variations in control effectiveness with angle of attack and control deflection except at large $\alpha + \delta$ and $M = 3.00$ and 4.23 , where it is observed that the effectiveness of both controls decreases markedly. Similar results have been observed in test results obtained at lower Mach numbers (see ref. 6).

The $A = 1$ control, which has the larger control-surface area, is, of course, a more powerful control than the $A = 4/9$ control. This is evident in figure 3. The lift coefficients presented in figure 3 are referenced to the base area of the body, however, and do not indicate the effectiveness per unit of control-surface area. A more informative comparison of the two controls has been made in figure 4, where their effectiveness parameters, $C_{L\delta}$ (measured at $\alpha = \delta = 0^\circ$), multiplied by the ratio of body-base area to control-surface area are presented as a function of Mach number. The results show that increasing the aspect ratio increases the control effectiveness (per unit of control-surface area) only at Mach numbers less than 5.0 . Above $M = 5.0$ the $A = 4/9$ control has essentially the same effectiveness as the $A = 1$ control. It is also shown in figure 5 that these trends are fairly well predicted by the linear-theory method of reference 2.¹ If the exposed panels were joined together, the $A = 4/9$ control would, of course, be less effective than the $A = 1$ control. The difference is made up by increased interference lift carried on the body. It should be noted that these compensating effects of control-body interference and aspect ratio are not unique to Mach numbers above 5.0 but could occur at other Mach numbers for different combinations of aspect ratio and ratios of body radius to control semispan. It is evident, then, that increasing the aspect ratio does not always increase control effectiveness. It is also evident from figure 4 that control effectiveness, as might be expected, is strongly dependent on Mach number. Large reductions in effectiveness occur as the test Mach number increases from 3.00 to 6.25 .

¹More detailed comparisons of theory and experiment are presented in a later section.

Lift-drag ratio.- The variations of lift-drag ratio with lift coefficient for both configurations at $M = 3.00$ are presented in figure 5. It is observed that the aspect-ratio-1 control provides higher lift-drag ratios at small control deflections, whereas the aspect-ratio-4/9 control provides higher ratios at large control deflections. The change is particularly evident between the curves for $\delta = 0^\circ$ and for $\delta = \pm 30^\circ$. Similar results were obtained at the higher Mach numbers.

Control normal force.- The variations of control-normal-force coefficient with angle of attack and control deflection are presented in figures 6 and 7 for both configurations tested. The results are somewhat nonlinear and tend to show an increase in control normal-force effectiveness, $(C_{N_c})_\alpha$, with increasing $|\alpha + \delta|$. A large part of the nonlinearity in the control normal forces, particularly at the higher Mach numbers, may be attributed to nonlinear variation of pressure coefficient with flow deflection angle. Another possible cause of nonlinearity at large α is the reduction of upwash angle at the control (see refs. 7, 8, and 9). Nonlinear variations of the local body upwash with δ are also possible since, due to the finite length of the chord, the leading and trailing edges of the control are a considerable distance away from the plane of greatest upwash when the controls are deflected to large angles.

Hinge-moment characteristics.- The variations of hinge-moment coefficients with angle of attack and with control deflection angle are shown in figures 8 and 9. In general, the results indicate that the hinge-moment coefficients decrease with increasing Mach number and aspect ratio. In most cases, the variations of hinge moment with α and δ are decidedly nonlinear. The primary sources of nonlinearities are, of course, the same as for the control normal forces. Another source of nonlinearity in the hinge-moment variations is center-of-pressure travel. This point becomes most evident at approximately $\alpha + \delta \geq 30^\circ$ for both controls at all Mach numbers tested (compare, e.g., figs. 6 and 8). For $\alpha + \delta > 30^\circ$, sharp reductions in hinge-moment coefficient are observed with increasing angle of attack, whereas normal-force coefficients continue to increase. A rapid movement of the center of pressure (toward the hinge line) is indicated. Thus, it appears that the controls cannot be closely balanced throughout the test range of angles of attack and control deflections.

Comparisons of Theory and Experiment

Control-body combinations.- The aerodynamic characteristics of the control-body combinations have been estimated by adding theoretical predictions for the controls (including contributions of control-body

interference) to the experimental characteristics of the body alone.² The theoretical predictions for the controls are based on the linear-theory methods of references 2, 3, and 12. The experimental characteristics of the body alone were reported in reference 13.

Comparisons of the estimated and experimental values of lift, drag, and pitching-moment coefficients at Mach numbers of 3.00 and 6.25 are shown in figures 10 and 11 for both control-body combinations tested. The agreement between theory and experiment is generally good to angles of attack of about 10° to 15° , except at large values of δ . It is of interest to note that the linear variations of lift and pitching moment are restricted to an exceedingly small range of angles of attack even at $M = 3.00$ and that the use of experimental characteristics for the body in the estimated results has accounted for most of the nonlinearities in the lift and pitching-moment curves of the control-body combinations. The major contribution to the nonlinearities for the body itself is the viscous cross force (see ref. 14).

Control-surface characteristics.— The normal-force characteristics of the controls have been estimated by means of the linear-theory methods of references 2 and 12 and the slender-airfoil shock-expansion method of reference 15.³ Two sets of calculations were performed with each method: First the control was considered to behave as a wing alone and, second, as a control in the presence of the body. The predicted and measured control normal-force coefficients, C_{Nc} , for the undeflected control, $\delta = 0^\circ$, are compared in figure 12. Linear theory with the effects of interference included seems to provide good estimates of the control normal forces at the smaller angles of attack; whereas the shock-expansion method with the effects of interference neglected is generally in agreement with the measurements at the larger angles of attack. Similar trends were noted for the other control deflection angles tested. The values predicted by linear theory (with the effects of interference included) and by the shock-expansion method (with interference effects neglected) are compared with measurements for the complete range of control deflections in figures 13 and 14. These comparisons would seem to indicate that, with increasing values of the hypersonic similarity parameter M_∞ , the normal-force characteristics of the control in the presence of the body approach those for the control alone. Such a result would be expected because at larger angles of attack, the flow about the body becomes hypersonic in character (i.e., it can, in the main, be described by Newtonian

²No correction was applied to the estimated characteristics of the control-body combinations for the effects of the streamwise gap between control and body. It was believed, on the basis of experimental results presented in references 10 and 11, that the effects of the gap would be negligible.

³The effects of the tip region were estimated on the basis of the method of reference 16. Unpublished data for rectangular wings at $M = 3.36$ indicate that the control normal forces predicted by use of this tip correction may be slightly low at the larger angles of attack.

flow concepts (see ref. 17)) and the upwash angle on the side of the body approaches the angle of attack of the body.

Both the linear-theory method and the slender-airfoil shock-expansion method (including an average upwash angle) have been used to estimate the control-surface parameters, $(C_{N_c})_\alpha$, $(C_{N_c})_\delta$, C_{h_α} , and C_{h_δ} (at $\alpha = \delta = 0^\circ$). The comparisons with experiment are shown in figure 15. Both methods provide rather good estimates of $(C_{N_c})_\alpha$ and $(C_{N_c})_\delta$, the normal-force curve slopes for linear theory being slightly lower than for the shock-expansion method due to the fact that linear theory neglects the effect of thickness on lift. Linear theory, however, provides a poor estimate of both C_{h_α} and C_{h_δ} . Linear theory is in error primarily in the prediction of the center of pressure on the control. Much of this error is due to the fact that the theory neglects any effect of airfoil section on center-of-pressure location. The slender-airfoil shock-expansion method, which considers this effect, provides a better estimate of these parameters, though the values of C_{h_α} are still underestimated. This error may be attributed to the tendency for a larger portion of the boundary layer on the body to flow over the control surface when the body is inclined. This flow could cause separation on the lee surface of the control and have a considerable effect on the hinge moments.

CONCLUSIONS

Analysis of the results of force tests on two rectangular-plan-form, all-movable controls of aspect ratios $4/9$ and 1 in combination with a slender body of revolution at Mach numbers from 3.00 to 6.25 and Reynolds numbers from 0.23 to 1.2 million has led to the following conclusions:

1. The variations of lift with angle of attack for the control-body combinations are somewhat nonlinear throughout the range of test Mach numbers. The major contributor to the nonlinearities is the body itself. Control normal forces are only slightly nonlinear throughout the range of angles of attack and control deflection. Control hinge moments, however, are linear only at small angles of attack and control deflection.

2. The aspect-ratio- 1 control is more effective than the aspect-ratio- $4/9$ control at Mach numbers less than 5 . At Mach numbers of 5 and above, the two controls have essentially the same effectiveness per unit of control-surface area. At small control deflections, the aspect-ratio- 1 control is more efficient than the aspect-ratio- $4/9$ control and provides higher lift-drag ratios at a given lift coefficient. At large control deflections the converse is true.

3. Nonlinearities in control effectiveness are generally small, except at large combined angles of attack and control deflection where

appreciable losses in control effectiveness are found. Control effectiveness decreases rapidly with increasing Mach number in accordance with theoretical predictions.

4. Estimates of the aerodynamic characteristics of the control-body combinations, which combined the experimental characteristics of the body and the linear theory predictions of the contributions of the controls (including wing-body interference), are generally good to angles of attack of about 10° to 15° .

5. Linear theory (including the effect of body upwash) provides good estimates of the control normal forces at small angles of attack and control deflection. At larger angles of attack and control deflection, and, in general, at the higher Mach numbers, control normal forces are generally better predicted by a slender-airfoil shock-expansion method neglecting the effect of interference, indicating that the normal-force characteristics of the control in the presence of the body approach those for the control alone with increasing values of the hypersonic similarity parameter, M_∞ .

6. Hinge-moment parameters are influenced to a large extent by the shape of the airfoil section and, hence, are not well predicted by linear theory. A method which considers this effect, the slender-airfoil shock-expansion method, provides better estimates of these parameters.

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics
Moffett Field, Calif., Oct. 7, 1955

REFERENCES

1. Tucker, Warren A.: A Method for Estimating the Components of Lift of Wing-Body Combinations at Supersonic Speeds. NACA RM L52D22, 1952.
2. Nielsen, Jack N., Kaattari, George E., and Drake, William C.: Comparison Between Prediction and Experiment for All-Movable Wing and Body Combinations at Supersonic Speeds - Lift, Pitching Moment, and Hinge Moment. NACA RM A52D29, 1952.
3. Katzen, Elliott D., and Pitts, William C.: Comparison Between Prediction and Experiment for All-Movable Wing and Body Combinations at Supersonic Speeds - Drag Due to Lift and Lift-Drag Ratio. NACA RM A52I30, 1952.

4. Eggers, A. J., Jr., and Nothwang, George J.: The Ames 10- by 14-Inch Supersonic Wind Tunnel. NACA TN 3095, 1954.
5. Eggers, A. J., Jr., Dennis, David H., and Resnikoff, Meyer M.: Bodies of Revolution for Minimum Drag at High Supersonic Airspeeds. NACA RM A51K27, 1952.
6. Kaattari, George E., Hill, William A., Jr., and Nielsen, Jack N.: Controls for Supersonic Missiles. NACA RM A55D12, 1955.
7. Winter, K. G., and Brown, C. S.: Supersonic Wind Tunnel Tests on Guided Weapon Control Surfaces Mounted on a Body. I - Tests at $M = 2$ of Rectangular Controls of Aspect Ratio 1.89. R.A.E. TN No. Aero. 2175, 1952.
8. Raney, D. J., and Pallant, R. J.: Measurements of Upwash Around Inclined Bodies at a Mach Number of 1.91. R.A.E. TN No. Aero. 2198, 1953.
9. Winter, K. G., and Brown, C. S.: Supersonic Wind Tunnel Tests on Guided Weapon Control Surfaces Mounted on a Body. II - Tests of a Rectangular Control of Aspect Ratio 2.93 and a Tapered Raked Control of Aspect Ratio 2.82. R.A.E. TN No. Aero. 2284, 1953.
10. Dugan, Duane W.: Experimental Investigation of Some Aerodynamic Effects of a Gap Between Wing and Body of a Moderately Slender Wing-Body Combination at a Mach Number of 1.4. NACA RM A55D08, 1955.
11. Kaattari, George E.: Pressure Distributions on Triangular and Rectangular Wings to High Angles of Attack - Mach Numbers 1.45 and 1.97. NACA RM A54D19, 1954.
12. Lagerstrom, P. A., Wall, D., and Graham, M. E.: Formulas in Three-Dimensional Wing Theory. Rep. No. SM-11901, Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., 1946.
13. Eggers, A. J., Jr., and Syvertson, Clarence A.: Experimental Investigation of a Body Flare for Obtaining Pitch Stability and a Body Flap for Obtaining Pitch Control in Hypersonic Flight. NACA RM A54J13, 1955.
14. Allen, H. Julian, and Perkins, Edward W.: A Study of Effects of Viscosity on Flow Over Slender Bodies of Revolution. NACA Rep. 1048, 1951.
15. Eggers, A. J., Jr., Syvertson, Clarence A., and Kraus, Samuel: A Study of Inviscid Flow About Airfoils at High Supersonic Speeds. NACA Rep. 1123, 1953.

16. Czarnecki, K. R., and Mueller, James N.: An Approximate Method of Calculating Pressures in the Tip Region of a Rectangular Wing of Circular-Arc Section at Supersonic Speeds. NACA TN 2211, 1950.
17. Dennis, David H., and Cunningham, Bernard E.: Forces and Moments on Inclined Bodies at Mach Numbers From 3.0 to 6.3. NACA RM A54E03, 1954.

TABLE I.- EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS FOR ASPECT-RATIO-4/9 CONTROL-BODY
COMBINATION
(a) $M = 3.00$; $M = 4.23$

α , deg	$M = 3.00$							$M = 4.23$						
	α , deg	C_L	C_D	C_m	C_h	C_{Hc}	\bar{z}	α	C_L	C_D	C_m	C_h	C_{Hc}	\bar{z}
0	-2.1	-0.205	0.183	0.098	-0.0089	-0.040	0.276	-2.0	-0.147	0.129	0.044	0.0012	-0.016	0.575
0	-0.002	.164	-.003	-.0011	.002	-.0011	.976	0	.012	.110	-.026	.0028	-.003	1.433
0	1.0	.086	.171	-.038	-.0089	.035	-.242	1.0	.059	.099	-.023	.0048	.002	-1.900
2.9	2.1	-.118	-.009	-.166	-.0089	.035	-.242	2.0	.130	.113	-.064	.0068	.008	-.350
2.9	2.9	.318	.209	-.166	-.0089	.035	-.242	4.9	.247	.187	-.277	-.017	-.017	-.378
5.0	5.0	.592	.237	-.318	-.0089	.035	-.242	8.0	.973	.268	-.489	.0176	.144	-.378
7.0	7.0	.927	.300	-.511	-.0089	.035	-.242	10.0	1.260	.363	-.628	.0209	.169	-.378
10.2	10.2	1.473	.458	-.789	-.0279	.221	.374	12.1	1.506	.467	-.804	.0231	.196	-.378
13.3	13.3	2.140	.697	-1.193	-.0301	.281	.393	18.4	2.843	1.134	-1.611	.0351	.284	-.378
17.8	17.8	3.101	1.206	-1.757	-.0330	.378	.397	20.5	3.275	1.349	-1.880	.0381	.326	-.378
20.9	20.9	3.790	1.667	-2.184	-.0432	.439	.402	22.6	3.690	1.668	-2.166	.0420	.374	-.378
24.1	24.1	4.437	2.265	-2.714	-.0483	.505	.404							
-10	-2.1	-.558	.299	.368	-.0292	-.222	.368	-2.1	-.449	.201	.291	-.0230	-.161	.357
-10	-1.1	-.318	.215	.239	-.0228	-.157	.355	0	-.234	.167	.185	-.0170	-.111	.347
-10	2.0	-.072	.805	.102	-.0149	-.068	.331	2.0	-.027	.164	-.073	-.0130	-.064	.297
-10	4.9	.287	.214	-.086	-.0161	.024	.183	4.9	.358	.172	-.138	-.0019	.038	.450
-10	8.0	.714	.276	-.291	-.0161	.024	.183	7.9	.794	.279	-.368	.0019	.038	.450
-10	10.1	1.123	.369	-.293	-.0161	.024	.183	10.0	1.101	.330	-.266	.0048	.058	.417
-10	12.2	1.570	.496	-.784	-.0204	.094	.282	12.0	1.420	.454	-.692	.0094	.071	.367
-10	17.2	2.797	1.017	-1.458	-.0245	.192	.372	18.4	2.913	.982	-1.338	.0162	.123	.370
-10	20.9	3.410	1.475	-1.879	-.0279	.244	.386	20.5	2.887	1.230	-1.576	.0176	.157	.368
-10	24.1	4.132	2.073	-2.298	-.0331	.328	.399	22.7	3.281	1.516	-1.836	.0218	.190	.369
10	-2.0	.072	.205	-.102	.0249	.068	.331	-2.0	.027	.164	-.073	.0130	.064	.297
10	2.1	.318	.215	.239	.0228	.157	.355	0	.234	.167	.185	.0170	.111	.347
10	2.1	.558	.299	.368	.0292	.222	.368	2.1	.449	.201	.291	.0230	.161	.357
10	5.0	.914	.340	-.045	.0422	.283	.326	2.9	.558	.220	-.341	.0361	.160	.274
10	8.1	1.376	.481	-.782	.0444	.386	.339	5.0	.795	.270	-.459	.0442	.195	.273
10	10.2	1.770	.604	-1.008	.0555	.419	.368	7.0	1.101	.339	-.635	.0448	.223	.297
10	12.3	2.208	.772	-1.268	.0554	.499	.379	8.0	1.176	.385	-.628	.0501	.292	.357
10	17.8	3.344	1.431	-1.976	.0573	.543	.392	10.0	1.512	.490	-.802	.0522	.328	.400
10	22.0	4.015	1.980	-2.412	.0598	.612	.402	12.1	1.859	.669	-1.042	.0542	.352	.403
10	24.2	4.631	2.455	-2.843	.0592	.704	.417	18.5	3.112	1.338	-1.844	.0550	.459	.380
								20.5	3.568	1.640	-2.124	.0572	.511	.368
								22.6	3.951	1.993	-2.431	.0575	.577	.400
-20	-2.2	-.881	.426	.608	-.0658	-.437	.350	-2.1	-.701	.334	.473	-.0436	-.339	.371
-20	-1.1	-.657	.351	.488	-.0561	-.376	.351	0	-.479	.272	.354	-.0350	-.273	.357
-20	1.9	-.440	.312	.379	-.0454	-.297	.347	2.0	-.256	.242	.236	-.0321	-.247	.352
-20	4.9	-.056	.277	.161	-.0177	-.117	.383	2.9	-.156	.230	.181	-.0277	-.181	.352
-20	6.9	.321	.272	-.041	-.0137	-.117	.383	4.9	.130	.217	.005	-.0277	-.181	.352
-20	10.1	.983	.312	-.404	-.0078	-.042	.314	6.9	.501	.244	-.203	-.0277	-.181	.352
-20	13.2	1.589	.577	-.764	-.0096	-.003	.357	7.9	.699	.278	-.272	-.0145	-.076	.314
-20	17.7	2.479	.990	-1.272	.0005	.032	.404	10.0	.963	.356	-.432	-.0124	-.062	.300
-20	20.8	3.111	1.378	-1.668	.0035	.060	.442	12.0	1.271	.462	-.595	-.0114	-.046	.258
-20	24.1	3.980	2.039	-2.241	.0073	.112	.435	18.4	2.396	.991	-1.222	-.0074	-.007	.257
								20.5	2.700	1.220	-1.435	-.0049	.005	1.500
								22.5	3.057	1.486	-1.670	-.0041	.019	.722
20	-1.9	.440	.312	-.379	.0454	.297	.347	-2.0	.256	.242	-.236	.0321	.247	.352
20	1.1	.657	.351	-.488	.0561	.376	.351	0	.479	.272	.354	.0350	.273	.357
20	2.2	.881	.426	-.608	.0658	.437	.350	2.1	.701	.334	.473	.0436	.339	.371
20	5.1	1.247	.533	-.800	.0741	.532	.361	3.0	.798	.365	-.511	-.0277	-.181	.352
20	6.6	1.481	.669	-.896	.0734	.592	.376	5.0	1.023	.433	-.621	-.0277	-.181	.352
20	10.3	2.034	.867	-1.216	.0632	.639	.401	7.0	1.292	.517	-.771	-.0277	-.181	.352
20	13.4	2.598	1.131	-1.540	.0553	.673	.418	8.0	1.485	.578	-.885	.0486	.469	.396
20	17.9	3.476	1.644	-2.057	.0538	.744	.428	10.1	1.769	.701	-1.095	.0440	.497	.412
20	21.0	3.937	2.046	-2.302	.0490	.818	.440	12.1	2.112	.863	-1.241	.0423	.533	.421
20	24.2	4.413	2.703	-.2943	.0467	.919	.449	18.5	3.280	1.579	-1.994	.0371	.674	.444
								20.5	3.690	1.906	-2.283	.0318	.748	.498
								22.6	4.066	2.307	-2.560	.0280	.828	.466
-30	-2.2	-1.095	.679	.742	-.0695	-.682	.398	-2.1	-.950	.386	.647	-.0689	-.584	.382
-30	-1.2	-.864	.589	.631	-.0764	-.603	.373	-1.1	-.751	.488	.545	-.0669	-.502	.367
-30	1.9	-.663	.509	.514	-.0767	-.506	.349	2.0	-.514	.427	.414	-.0609	-.425	.357
-30	4.8	-.333	.437	.341	-.0555	-.341	.349	2.9	-.393	.397	.336	-.0555	-.341	.357
-30	6.9	.032	.405	.129	-.0405	-.215	.312	4.9	-.065	.349	.199	-.0555	-.341	.357
-30	10.0	.701	.456	-.242	-.0405	-.215	.312	6.9	.282	.321	-.066	-.0498	-.234	.304
-30	13.2	1.375	.614	-.636	-.0434	-.199	.227	7.9	.463	.357	-.143	-.0467	-.210	.276
-30	17.6	2.279	1.017	-1.139	-.0349	-.125	.221	10.0	.766	.419	-.314	-.0474	-.199	.262
-30	20.3	2.890	1.395	-1.515	-.0373	-.104	.142	12.0	1.097	.511	-.488	-.0440	-.173	.246
-30	24.0	3.767	1.985	-2.102	-.0384	-.077	0	18.4	2.166	1.029	-1.179	-.0455	-.170	.232
								20.5	2.511	1.273	-1.360	-.0455	-.170	.232
								22.5	2.868	1.538	-1.600	-.0450	-.165	.209
30	-1.9	.663	.509	-.514	.0695	.606	.363	-2.0	.514	.427	-.414	.0609	.425	.357
30	1.2	.864	.589	-.631	.0764	.603	.373	-1.1	.751	.488	-.545	.0669	.502	.367
30	2.2	1.095	.679	-.742	.0767	.682	.398	2.1	.950	.386	.647	.0689	.584	.382
30	5.1	1.355	.890	-.890	.0793	.793	.394	3.0	1.121	.533	-.754	.1040	.572	.316
30	7.2	1.631	.969	-1.004	.0792	.792	.347	5.0	1.323	.706	-.874	.1100	.583	.311
30	10.3	2.020	1.064	-1.211	.0680	.759	.331	7.0	1.596	.782	-.978	.1110	.560	.302
30	13.4	2.486	1.299	-1.472	.0620	.759	.418	8.0	1.601	.798	-.978	.0686	.636	.352
30	17.9	3.425	1.874	-2.064	.0332	.875	.462	10.1	1.874	.921	-1.125	.0571	.708	.419
30	21.0	4.024	2.369	-.0371	.0371	.954	.461	12.1	2.177	1.087	-1.343	.0501	.701	.429
30	24.2	4.593	3.085	-.0244	.0244	1.024	.476	18.5	3.288	1.846	-2.033	.0199	.874	.482
								20.5	3.668	2.160	-2.308	.0087	.926	.491
								22.6	4.010	2.520	-2.575	.0023	.973	.498

TABLE I.- EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS FOR ASPECT-RATIO-4/9 CONTROL-BODY
COMBINATION - Concluded.
(b) $M = 5.05$; $M = 6.25$

M = 5.05													M = 6.25												
δ , deg	α , deg	C_L	C_D	C_m	C_h	C_{m_0}	\bar{z}	α	C_L	C_D	C_m	C_h	C_{m_0}	\bar{z}											
0	-2.0	-0.181	0.119	0.100	-0.0044	-0.032	0.393	-2.0	-0.149	0.147	0.094	-0.0027	-0.012	-0.164											
	0	.008	.111	-.008	0	-.003	.845	0	.001	.140	.008	0	.007	1.162											
	2.0	.169	.129	-.067	.0046	.025	.274	2.0	.193	.190	-.090	.0090	.066	.900											
	2.9	.311	.144	-.147	---	---	---	4.9	.491	.197	-.270	---	---	---											
	4.9	.592	.132	-.175	---	---	---	7.9	.792	.291	-.396	.0160	.081	.902											
	6.9	.827	.242	-.429	---	---	---	9.9	1.012	.367	-.541	.0180	.101	.922											
	7.9	.866	.281	-.424	-.0110	.118	.407	11.9	1.290	.464	-.667	.0210	.131	.940											
	9.9	1.148	.379	-.792	-.0120	.146	.418	13.1	2.293	1.010	-1.342	.0241	.228	.994											
	11.9	1.437	.497	-.703	.0140	.176	.421	20.1	2.612	1.296	-1.532	.0282	.276	.999											
	18.3	2.683	1.179	-1.470	.0643	.299	.406	22.2	3.012	1.932	-1.758	.0313	.326	.404											
	20.3	3.049	1.332	-1.742	.0662	.308	.415																		
	22.3	3.469	1.693	-2.034	.0908	.362	.415																		
-10	-2.0	-.371	.190	.268	-.0170	-.146	.404	-2.0	-.346	.182	.192	-.0190	-.106	-.429											
	0	-.196	.193	-.100	-.0110	-.092	.391	0	-.164	.193	.101	-.0110	-.096	.993											
	2.0	.038	.190	-.006	-.0080	-.095	.373	2.0	.008	.147	.016	-.0100	-.094	.993											
	2.9	.186	.177	-.082	---	---	---	4.9	.680	.264	-.292	-.0010	.007	.643											
	4.9	.428	.182	-.206	---	---	---	10.0	.915	.318	-.436	.0020	.019	.991											
	6.9	.692	.226	-.347	---	---	---	12.0	1.141	.410	-.591	.0030	.032	.406											
	7.9	.747	.299	-.332	-.0010	.017	.441	18.1	2.100	.878	-1.184	.0096	.096	.442											
	9.9	1.016	.339	-.465	.0010	.029	.447	20.1	2.449	1.099	-1.432	.0128	.120	.993											
	11.9	1.290	.403	-.606	.0020	.044	.499	22.2	2.808	1.377	-1.699	.0143	.199	.408											
	18.2	2.369	.992	-1.222	.0131	.106	.376																		
	20.3	2.739	1.196	-1.494	.0119	.144	.417																		
	22.3	3.133	1.474	-1.718	.0209	.166	.374																		
10	-2.0	-.098	.190	-.006	.0070	.096	.379	-2.0	-.006	.147	-.016	.0100	.034	.993											
	0	-.196	.193	-.100	.0100	.092	.391	0	-.164	.193	-.101	.0110	.096	.993											
	2.0	.371	.190	-.208	.0140	.146	.404	2.0	.346	.182	-.192	.0130	.106	.429											
	2.9	.553	.209	-.362	.0402	.131	.193	7.9	.996	.373	-.536	.0130	.219	.441											
	4.9	.791	.261	-.466	.0436	.167	.298	9.9	1.226	.478	-.697	.0260	.283	.410											
	6.9	1.099	.339	-.690	.0904	.187	.228	12.0	1.462	.606	-.800	.0230	.280	.418											
	7.9	1.133	.391	-.618	.0204	.232	.412	18.1	2.490	1.220	-1.483	-.0015	.463	.903											
	9.9	1.420	.494	-.776	.0268	.297	.396	20.2	2.619	1.923	-1.740	-.0142	.930	.927											
	11.9	1.706	.631	-.925	.0321	.389	.387	22.2	3.242	1.896	-2.042	-.0112	.977	.919											
	18.3	2.802	1.309	-1.600	.0633	.436	.394																		
	20.3	3.176	1.612	-1.898	.0497	.503	.409																		
	22.3	3.607	1.940	-2.162	.0905	.569	.411																		
-20	-2.0	-.660	.308	.433	-.0322	-.317	.399	-2.0	-.525	.296	.349	-.0327	-.199	.936											
	0	-.418	.240	.307	-.0298	-.243	.377	0	-.273	.208	.193	-.0362	-.125	.210											
	2.0	-.203	.211	.207	-.0276	-.199	.399	2.0	-.096	.201	.117	-.0301	-.131	.270											
	2.9	-.184	.221	.109	---	---	---	4.9	.204	.192	-.099	-.1039	-.003	34.1											
	4.9	.236	.222	-.076	---	---	---	7.9	.536	.267	-.218	-.0229	-.067	.164											
	6.9	.335	.299	-.224	---	---	---	9.9	.716	.349	-.315	-.0220	-.092	.073											
	7.9	.637	.269	-.260	-.0190	-.076	.290	11.9	.943	.446	-.509	-.0210	-.040	-.024											
	9.9	.906	.357	-.401	-.0163	-.097	.214	18.1	1.832	.942	-1.043	-.0199	-.013	-.988											
	11.9	1.191	.498	-.597	-.0147	-.046	.181	20.1	2.209	1.193	-1.279	-.0180	-.001	-19.9											
	18.2	2.208	.972	-1.131	-.0073	-.019	.117	22.2	2.963	1.421	-1.900	-.0149	.012	1.796											
	20.3	2.940	1.199	-1.337	-.0090	-.004	6.113																		
	22.3	2.917	1.496	-1.989	-.0102	-.015	1.180																		
20	-2.0	.203	.211	-.207	.0276	.199	.399	-2.0	.096	.202	-.117	.0301	.131	.270											
	0	.418	.240	.307	.0298	.243	.377	0	.273	.208	-.193	.0362	.125	.210											
	2.0	.660	.308	.433	.0322	.317	.399	2.0	.525	.296	.349	.0327	.199	.936											
	2.9	.792	.348	.518	.0396	.397	.400	4.9	.846	.362	-.531	---	---	---											
	4.9	1.014	.419	-.631	.0368	.407	.410	7.9	1.202	.515	-.719	.0210	.379	.444											
	6.9	1.298	.499	-.769	.0346	.431	.420	9.9	1.473	.640	-.892	.0210	.417	.490											
	7.9	1.433	.596	-.898	.0366	.436	.418	11.9	1.792	.779	-1.082	.0140	.471	.470											
	10.0	1.708	.686	-1.012	.0318	.481	.494	18.2	2.790	1.401	-1.762	---	---	---											
	12.0	2.029	.849	-1.202	.0277	.526	.447	20.2	3.168	1.787	-2.033	---	---	---											
	18.3	2.973	1.661	-1.792	.0243	.675	.464	22.2	3.601	2.182	-2.390	---	---	---											
	20.3	3.491	1.998	-2.144	.0229	.749	.470																		
	22.3	3.928	2.296	-2.499	.0229	.832	.473																		
-30	-2.1	-.815	.927	.948	-.0716	-.518	.362	-2.0	-.728	.411	.489	---	---	---											
	0	-.690	.439	.491	-.0692	-.436	.341	0	-.478	.379	.361	---	---	---											
	2.0	-.461	.460	.397	-.0648	-.406	.340	2.0	-.395	.349	.306	---	---	---											
	2.9	-.301	.393	.274	---	---	---	4.9	.029	.369	.034	---	---	---											
	4.9	.011	.362	.092	---	---	---	7.9	.403	.411	-.148	---	---	---											
	6.9	.318	.373	-.091	---	---	---	9.9	.604	.471	-.267	---	---	---											
	7.9	.64	.396	-.199	-.0990	-.218	.229	11.9	.804	.544	-.396	---	---	---											
	9.9	.737	.448	-.299	-.0990	-.207	.215	18.1	1.692	.949	-.910	---	---	---											
	11.9	1.018	.528	-.492	-.0600	-.200	.200	20.1	1.978	1.164	-1.104	---	---	---											
	18.2	1.985	1.033	-1.080	-.0964	-.189	.202	22.1	2.379	1.424	-1.377	---	---	---											
	20.2	2.339	1.297	-1.239	-.0622	-.188	.169																		
	22.3	2.684	1.980	-1.472	-.0962	-.204	.229																		
30	-2.0	.461	.480	-.397	.0648	.406	.340	-2.0	.396	.345	-.306	---	---	---											
	0	.690	.439	-.431	.0592	.436	.341	0	.478	.379	-.361	---	---	---											
	2.1	.815	.927	-.948	.0716	.518	.362	2.0	.728	.411	-.489	---	---	---											
	2.9	1.070	.373	-.711	---	---	---	4.9	1.102	.479	-.799	---	---	---											
	4.9	1.266	.437	-.807	---	---	---	7.9	1.501	.614	-.990	---	---	---											
	7.9	1.604	.718	-.992	.0907	.617	.418	9.9	1.799	.796	-1.137	---	---	---											
	9.9	1.987	.870	-1.179	.0421	.694	.436	11.9	2.094	.932	-1.333	---	---	---											
	12.0	2.196	1.062	-1.364	.0363	.696	.440	18.2	3.084	1.818	-2.009	---	---	---											
	18.3	3.360	1.993	-2.121	---	---	---	20.2	3.640	2.087	-2.096	---	---	---											
	20.3	3.638	2.220	-2.299	---	---	---	22.2	3.637	2.541	-2.398	---	---	---											
	22.4	3.960	2.587	-2.929	---	---	---																		

TABLE II.- EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS FOR ASPECT-RATIO-1 CONTROL-BODY COMBINATION

(a) $M = 3.00$; $M = 4.23$

δ , deg	α , deg	$M = 3.00$						δ , deg	α , deg	$M = 4.23$					
		C_L	C_D	C_m	C_n	C_{n_c}	\bar{x}			C_L	C_D	C_m	C_n	C_{n_c}	\bar{x}
0	-2.1	-0.392	0.213	0.220	-0.0064	-0.098	0.390	0	-2.0	-0.308	0.165	0.183	-0.0019	-0.048	0.461
	0	-0.016	.181	.021	-.0008	-.024	.467		0	-0.030	.148	.018	-.0029	-.008	.494
	1.0	-.146	.190	-.076	-.0034	-.023	.392		2.0	-.248	.161	-.145	-.0082	-.031	.234
	2.1	.320	.206	-.179	-.0036	.092	.431		2.9	.406	.173	-.252	---	---	---
	4.2	.700	.292	-.409	-.0062	.114	.446		5.0	.716	.210	-.423	---	---	---
	7.2	1.406	.365	-.826	-.0220	.213	.397		7.0	1.002	.268	-.635	---	---	---
	10.3	2.176	.603	-1.297	-.0260	.291	.411		8.0	1.325	.356	-.724	.0170	.155	.390
	13.5	3.000	.923	-1.806	-.0310	.363	.415		10.1	1.747	.477	-.995	.0200	.186	.393
	16.0	4.160	1.599	-2.330	-.0379	.460	.421		12.1	2.130	.626	-1.196	.0220	.222	.401
	21.2	4.956	2.109	-2.683	-.0439	.564	.422		18.5	3.253	1.444	-2.119	.0292	.348	.416
									20.6	4.045	1.757	-2.475	.0326	.402	.419
									22.7	4.956	2.168	-2.877	.0374	.467	.420
-10	-4.4	-1.981	.510	1.065	-.0289	-.333	.418	-10	-2.1	-.837	.293	.570	-.0156	-.202	.422
	-2.3	-1.181	.396	.816	-.0243	-.277	.412		-1.1	-.527	.228	.387	-.0120	-.148	.419
	-2	-.812	.303	.594	-.0184	-.211	.413		2.0	-.230	.201	.214	-.0080	-.101	.421
	2.0	-.420	.260	.369	-.0136	-.135	.399		2.9	-.087	.183	.114	---	---	---
	4.9	.140	.218	.012	-.0048	-.049	.402		4.9	.251	.180	-.062	---	---	---
	7.0	.596	.265	-.231	-.0030	.010	.400		6.9	.604	.215	-.286	---	---	---
	10.2	1.325	.387	-.655	-.0110	.080	.393		8.0	.814	.231	-.378	.0012	.012	.400
	13.4	2.091	.610	-1.108	-.0140	.140	.400		10.0	1.172	.318	-.576	.0040	.032	.375
	17.8	3.227	1.153	-1.812	-.0184	.219	.416		12.0	1.942	.433	-.784	.0060	.054	.389
	21.0	4.018	1.537	-2.335	-.0213	.292	.426		18.4	2.776	1.069	-1.219	.0129	.136	.407
	24.2	4.957	2.197	-2.718	-.0258	.375	.427		20.5	3.260	1.346	-1.645	.0154	.172	.411
									22.6	3.694	1.699	-2.129	.0197	.209	.406
10	-2.0	.420	.260	-.369	-.0136	-.135	.399	10	-2.0	.230	.201	-.214	.0080	.101	.421
	.2	.812	.303	-.594	-.0184	-.211	.413		.1	.527	.228	-.387	.0120	.148	.419
	2.3	1.181	.396	-.816	-.0243	-.277	.412		2.1	.837	.293	-.570	.0156	.202	.422
	4.4	1.981	.510	-1.065	-.0289	-.333	.418		3.0	1.030	.283	-.697	---	---	---
	7.3	2.177	.794	-1.385	-.0486	.467	.396		5.0	1.347	.413	-.887	---	---	---
	10.5	2.877	1.064	-1.819	-.0599	.543	.397		7.0	1.705	.537	-1.098	---	---	---
	13.7	3.643	1.474	-2.318	-.0604	.621	.403		8.1	2.010	.622	-1.254	.0341	.351	.403
	16.1	4.618	2.048	-2.696	-.0579	.745	.422		10.1	2.427	.761	-1.507	.0348	.398	.413
									12.2	2.877	.994	-1.784	.0371	.448	.417
									18.6	4.342	1.819	-2.653	---	---	---
									20.7	4.837	2.199	-3.149	.0926	.696	.425
									22.5	5.444	2.770	-3.645	.0997	.761	.424
-20	-4.5	-2.356	1.023	1.635	-.0643	-.633	.399	-20	-2.2	-1.489	.636	1.038	-.0334	-.435	.423
	-2.4	-2.007	.822	1.417	-.0526	-.561	.406		-1.1	-1.161	.505	.837	-.0294	-.363	.419
	-3	-1.654	.680	1.201	-.0433	-.486	.411		1.9	-.846	.415	.632	-.0212	-.303	.430
	1.8	-1.261	.568	.944	-.0361	-.404	.411		2.8	-.630	.382	.525	---	---	---
	4.8	-.648	.445	.575	-.0319	-.271	.392		4.9	-.289	.327	.269	---	---	---
	6.9	-.097	.380	.290	---	---	---		6.9	.197	.319	0	---	---	---
	10.1	.747	.417	-.266	-.0137	-.087	.343		7.9	.388	.341	-.067	-.0182	-.120	.348
	13.3	1.528	.577	-.716	-.0241	-.029	.014		10.0	.739	.399	-.264	-.0168	-.097	.327
	17.7	2.497	.980	-1.274	-.0107	.047	.728		12.0	1.090	.491	-.457	-.0168	-.079	.287
	20.8	3.204	1.396	-1.757	-.0076	.055	.636		18.4	2.246	1.010	-1.171	-.0153	-.029	-.068
	24.0	3.956	1.912	-2.254	-.0036	.099	.538		20.4	2.639	1.247	-1.424	-.0144	-.014	-.229
									22.5	3.034	1.523	-1.686	-.0114	.004	3.350
20	-1.8	1.261	.568	-.944	.0361	.404	.411	20	-1.9	.846	.415	-.632	.0212	.303	.430
	.3	1.654	.680	-1.201	.0433	.486	.411		.1	1.161	.505	-.837	.0294	.363	.419
	2.4	2.007	.822	-1.417	.0526	.561	.406		2.2	1.489	.636	-1.038	.0334	.435	.423
	4.5	2.356	1.023	-1.635	.0643	.633	.399		3.0	1.657	.744	-1.105	.0348	.452	.333
	7.5	2.958	1.409	-2.092	.0776	.711	.351		5.1	1.933	.888	-1.297	.0399	.508	.350
	10.6	3.307	1.689	-2.362	.0639	.774	.418		7.1	2.249	1.042	-1.484	.0397	.570	.322
	13.7	4.160	2.106	-2.796	.0593	.843	.435		8.1	2.548	1.113	-1.708	.0424	.595	.428
									10.2	2.937	1.339	-1.969	.0457	.629	.427
									12.2	3.336	1.613	-2.240	.0492	.683	.434
-30	-4.6	-2.836	1.727	2.008	-.0735	-.890	.418	-30	-2.3	-2.125	1.281	1.490	-.0621	-.703	.412
	-2.5	-2.611	1.561	1.879	-.0725	-.824	.412		-2	-1.809	1.081	1.289	-.0527	-.634	.417
	-2.5	-2.318	1.363	1.646	-.0671	-.761	.412		1.9	-1.449	.921	1.092	-.0444	-.548	.419
	1.6	-1.948	1.183	1.419	-.0606	-.673	.410		2.8	-1.249	.803	.892	---	---	---
	4.7	-1.325	.925	.977	---	---	---		4.8	-.694	.738	.638	---	---	---
	6.8	-.804	.769	.664	-.0497	-.454	.391		6.9	-.397	.622	.364	---	---	---
	9.9	.070	.704	.132	---	---	---		7.9	-.160	.634	.278	-.0420	-.321	.369
	13.1	.887	.796	-.340	-.0490	-.242	.314		9.9	.193	.664	.069	-.0440	-.278	.345
	17.6	1.894	1.133	-.904	-.0467	-.196	.262		12.0	.941	.733	-.133	.0450	-.238	.318
	20.7	2.901	1.493	-1.319	-.0476	-.171	.222		18.3	1.939	1.176	-.796	-.0517	-.246	.290
	23.9	3.176	1.955	-1.771	-.0492	-.145	.161		20.4	1.925	1.342	-1.000	-.0509	-.245	.292
									22.4	2.275	1.625	-1.240	-.0569	-.245	.268
30	-1.6	1.946	1.182	-1.419	.0606	.673	.410	30	-1.9	1.449	.921	-1.092	.0444	.548	.419
	.5	2.318	1.363	-1.646	.0671	.761	.412		.2	1.809	1.081	-1.289	.0527	.634	.417
	2.5	2.611	1.561	-1.879	.0725	.824	.412		2.3	2.125	1.281	-1.490	.0621	.703	.412
	4.6	2.836	1.727	-2.008	.0735	.890	.418		3.1	2.279	1.436	-1.593	.0689	.754	.382
	7.5	3.259	2.136	-2.289	.0689	1.001	.432		5.1	2.544	1.574	-1.773	.0860	.766	.391
	10.7	3.769	2.467	-2.648	.0398	1.090	.462		7.2	2.802	1.734	-1.992	.0778	.811	.404
	13.9	4.388	2.980	-3.100	.0199	1.112	.485		8.2	3.016	1.877	-2.083	.0462	.808	.443
									10.3	3.348	2.128	-2.315	.0386	.893	.429
									12.3	3.720	2.438	-2.599	.0329	.901	.464

TABLE II.- EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS FOR ASPECT-RATIO-1 CONTROL-BODY
COMBINATION - Concluded.
(b) $M = 5.05$; $M = 6.25$

δ , deg	α , deg	$M = 5.05$							$M = 6.25$						
		C_L	C_D	C_m	C_h	C_{m_c}	\bar{x}		α	C_L	C_D	C_m	C_h	C_{m_c}	\bar{x}
0	-2.0	-0.254	0.170	-0.121	-0.0027	-0.038	0.429	-2.0	-0.206	0.202	0.113	-0.0055	-0.024	-0.024	0.270
	0	-0.002	.151	-.010	-0.0024	0.001	-	0	-.004	.194	.007	-.0009	-.0001	-.001	.400
	2.0	.259	.171	-.149	0.0052	0.029	.317	2.0	.196	.214	-.099	.0014	0.025	.0025	.445
	2.9	.396	.176	-.214	-	-	-	4.9	.567	.236	-	-	-	-	-
	4.9	.689	.218	-.378	-	-	-	7.9	.960	.343	-.521	.0146	.107	.364	.364
	6.9	1.001	.283	-.552	-	-	-	9.9	1.240	.438	-.723	.0175	.136	.371	.371
	7.9	1.217	.362	-.704	.0167	.132	.374	11.9	1.562	.562	-.937	.0212	.170	.375	.375
	10.0	1.556	.469	-.907	.0189	.165	.366	18.2	2.784	1.252	-1.716	.026	.330	.421	.421
	12.0	1.932	.614	-1.143	.0227	.200	.367	20.2	3.251	1.606	-2.064	.0276	.399	.430	.430
	18.3	3.257	1.354	-1.956	.0296	.311	.404	22.2	3.775	1.980	-2.423	.0296	.472	.437	.437
	20.3	3.779	1.699	-2.331	.0325	.377	.414	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	22.4	4.328	2.101	-2.766	.0377	.449	.416	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-10	-2.1	-.743	.280	.469	-.0129	-.173	.426	-2.0	-.618	.294	.432	-.0139	-.141	.402	.402
	0	-.437	.216	.293	-.0084	-.126	.433	0	-.351	.245	.270	-.0105	-.100	.395	.395
	2.0	-.164	.181	.139	-.0071	-.083	.415	2.0	-.106	.212	.120	-.0075	-.071	.394	.394
	2.9	0	.193	.056	-	-	-	4.9	.291	.186	-.139	-	-	-	-
	4.9	.300	.192	-.111	-	-	-	7.9	.595	.249	-.145	-	-	-	-
	6.9	.617	.240	-.291	-	-	-	9.9	.898	.307	-.290	-.0090	.005	2.300	2.300
	7.9	.749	.278	-.348	.0042	.003	-.900	11.9	1.093	.393	-.420	-.0040	.024	.667	.667
	9.9	1.059	.355	-.514	.0058	.022	.236	18.1	2.122	1.049	-1.215	.0034	.107	.468	.468
	12.0	1.379	.445	-.686	.0066	.046	.378	20.2	2.569	1.268	-1.526	.0068	.139	.451	.451
	18.2	2.565	1.052	-1.405	.0058	.114	.414	22.2	3.081	1.476	-1.875	.0112	.177	.437	.437
	20.3	3.000	1.307	-1.697	.0101	.151	.433	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	22.4	3.456	1.611	-2.009	.0133	.193	.431	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	-2.0	.164	.181	-.139	.0071	.083	.415	-2.0	.106	.212	-.120	.0075	.071	.394	.394
	0	.437	.216	-.293	.0084	.126	.433	0	.351	.245	-.270	.0105	.100	.395	.395
	2.1	.743	.280	-.469	.0129	-.173	.426	2.0	.618	.294	-.432	.0139	.141	.402	.402
	2.9	1.220	.270	-.094	-	-	-	7.9	1.564	.547	-.999	.0250	.298	.403	.403
	4.9	1.236	.378	-.775	-	-	-	9.9	1.954	.695	-1.271	.0270	.306	.412	.412
	7.0	1.593	.477	-.990	-	-	-	11.9	2.320	.875	-1.522	.0290	.368	.421	.421
	8.0	1.794	.558	-1.067	.0275	.305	.410	18.2	3.613	1.819	-2.285	-	-	-	-
	10.0	2.130	.723	-1.327	.0304	.354	.414	20.2	4.183	2.276	-2.705	-	-	-	-
	12.0	2.527	.932	-1.594	.0333	.406	.418	22.2	4.762	2.761	-3.149	-	-	-	-
	18.3	4.100	1.750	-2.623	.0325	.582	.434	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	20.4	4.688	2.409	-3.053	.0371	.681	.446	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	22.4	5.300	2.936	-3.529	.0427	.782	.445	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-20	-2.1	-1.376	.583	.283	-.0386	-.392	.401	-2.0	-1.132	.528	.816	-.0327	-.321	.398	.398
	-1.1	-1.009	.460	.709	-.0357	-.318	.388	0	-.825	.425	.619	-.0322	-.258	.375	.375
	2.0	-.678	.389	.513	-.0321	-.260	.377	2.0	-.554	.374	.433	-.0313	-.221	.358	.358
	2.9	-.466	.336	.377	-.0267	-.231	.365	7.9	.269	.390	-.038	-.0220	-.132	.333	.333
	4.9	-.105	.333	.166	-.0253	-.173	.354	9.9	.536	.367	-.218	-.0210	-.118	.322	.322
	6.9	.224	.390	-.024	-.0226	-.142	.341	11.9	.813	.450	-.421	-.0230	-.103	.277	.277
	7.9	.396	.374	-.117	-.0206	-.121	.330	18.1	1.695	1.002	-.829	-.0198	-.088	.275	.275
	9.9	.666	.429	-.281	-.0201	-.103	.305	20.1	2.019	1.241	-1.102	-.0189	-.084	.275	.275
	11.9	.998	.513	-.462	-.0189	-.090	.295	22.2	2.426	1.524	-1.427	-.0195	-.068	.272	.272
	18.2	2.054	1.026	-1.038	-.0184	-.051	.139	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	20.2	2.439	1.257	-1.277	-.0148	-.045	.171	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	22.3	2.829	1.524	-1.542	-.0143	-.030	.023	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	-2.0	.678	.389	-.513	.0321	.260	.377	-2.0	.554	.374	-.433	.0313	.221	.358	.358
	-1.1	1.009	.460	-.709	.0357	.318	.388	0	.825	.425	-.619	.0322	.258	.375	.375
	2.1	1.376	.583	-.283	-.0386	-.392	.401	2.0	1.132	.528	-.816	.0327	.321	.398	.398
	2.9	1.552	.664	-1.040	.0525	.397	.368	7.9	2.144	.941	-1.466	.0401	.469	.415	.415
	5.0	1.887	.788	-1.252	.0557	.457	.378	9.9	2.500	1.151	-1.726	.0390	.548	.429	.429
	7.0	2.235	.960	-1.465	.1022	.511	.267	12.0	2.920	1.421	-2.065	.0340	.633	.446	.446
	8.0	2.436	1.095	-1.571	.0476	.532	.414	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	10.0	2.833	1.314	-1.809	.0485	.608	.420	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	12.1	3.249	1.588	-2.124	.0524	.672	.422	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-2.1	-1.932	1.137	1.331	-.0522	-.601	.423	-2.0	-1.729	1.037	1.270	-	-	-	-
	-1.1	-1.554	.963	1.127	-.0557	-.599	.407	0	-1.559	.872	1.036	-	-	-	-
	1.9	-1.306	.875	.949	-.0536	-.554	.403	2.0	-1.155	.810	.899	-	-	-	-
-30	2.8	-.997	.805	.704	-	-	-	4.9	-.717	.708	-	-	-	-	-
	4.9	-.636	.733	.498	-	-	-	7.8	-.466	.658	.264	-	-	-	-
	6.9	-.355	.657	.361	-	-	-	9.9	-.061	.689	.143	-	-	-	-
	7.9	-.174	.664	.245	-.0470	-.321	.354	11.9	.143	.753	.017	-	-	-	-
	9.9	.118	.693	.107	-.0500	-.303	.335	18.1	.971	1.158	-.479	-	-	-	-
	11.9	.413	.762	-.104	-.0540	-.285	.311	20.1	1.158	1.406	-.618	-	-	-	-
	18.2	1.392	1.226	-.670	-.0580	-.297	.281	22.1	1.480	1.661	-.825	-	-	-	-
	20.2	1.700	1.424	-.864	-.0609	-.294	.293	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	22.2	2.018	1.664	-1.079	-.0635	-.306	.293	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-1.9	1.306	.875	-.949	.0536	.554	.403	-2.0	1.155	.810	-.899	-	-	-	-
	-1.1	1.554	.963	-1.127	.0557	.599	.407	0	1.559	.872	-1.036	-	-	-	-
	2.1	1.932	1.137	-1.331	.0522	.601	.423	2.0	1.729	1.037	-1.270	-	-	-	-
	3.0	2.169	1.302	-1.498	.0789	.726	.397	4.9	2.192	1.893	-	-	-	-	-
30	5.0	2.444	1.489	-1.668	.0773	.772	.400	7.9	2.611	1.636	-1.863	-	-	-	-
	7.0	2.743	1.700	-1.862	.0738	.819	.410	9.9	2.948	1.920	-2.125	-	-	-	-
	8.0	2.944	1.788	-2.009	.0700	.799	.434	11.9	3.342	2.258	-2.477	-	-	-	-
	10.0	3.279	2.048	-2.241	.0449	.808	.446	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	12.1	3.687	2.382	-2.561	.0364	.875	.456	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-




Figure 1.- Details of control-body combinations tested.




Figure 2.- Aerodynamic characteristics of the $A = 4/9$ and $A = 1$ control-body combinations.



(b) $M = 4.23$

Figure 2.- Continued.



(c) $M = 5.05$
Figure 2.- Continued.


(d) $M = 6.25$

Figure 2.- Concluded.




Figure 3.- Variation of lift coefficient with control-deflection angle for both control-body combinations.




Figure 4.- Variation of control effectiveness with Mach number for both controls tested.




Figure 5.— Variation of lift-drag ratio with lift coefficient for both control-body combinations at $M = 3.00$.




Figure 6.- Variation of control-normal-force coefficient with angle of attack and control deflection for the $A = 4/9$ control.




Figure 7.- Variation of control-normal-force coefficient with angle of attack and control deflection for the $A = 1$ control.




Figure 8.— Variation of hinge-moment coefficient with angle of attack and control deflection for the $A = 4/9$ control.




Figure 10.— Comparison of theory and experiment for the aerodynamic characteristics of the $A = 4/9$ control-body combination.


(b) $M = 6.25$

Figure 10.- Concluded.


(a) $M = 3.00$

Figure 11.— Comparison of theory and experiment for the aerodynamic characteristics of the $A = 1$ control-body combination.

moved to body base area (See p5)


(b) $M = 6.25$

Figure 11.- Concluded.




Figure 12.- Variation of control-normal-force coefficient with angle of attack for $\delta = 0^\circ$



(a) $M = 3.00$ (b) $M = 4.23$

Figure 13.— Variation of control-normal-force coefficient with angle of attack for the $A = 4/9$ control.




Figure 13.- Concluded.




Figure 14.- Variation of control-normal-force coefficient with angle of attack for the $A = 1$ control.




Figure 14.- Concluded.




Figure 15.- Variation of control surface parameters with Mach number for both controls (at $\alpha = \delta = 0^\circ$).




Figure 15.- Concluded.